



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

XXXIV. *Remarks on the Zend Language, and the Zendavesta; in a Letter from the late Professor EMANUEL RASK, F.M.R.A.S., &c. &c., to the Honourable MOUNTSTUART ELPHINSTONE, M.R.A.S., then President of the Literary Society at Bombay.*

(Communicated by the Bombay Branch ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY.)

Read the 5th of May 1832.

THE foundation for the following remarks, or the text, as it were, on which I shall comment, will be Mr. ERSKINE's very learned and curious essay "on the sacred books and religion of the *Pársís*."* My opinion, it is true, differs almost entirely from that of Mr. ERSKINE; but I feel convinced that neither this truly liberal and amiable scholar, nor the LITERARY SOCIETY, will be displeased at seeing the same object represented in two different points of view. Either of the opposite opinions, or perhaps both of them, may be false, and yet the discussion of the subject may effect a step towards that truth and clearness which are the noble ends of every reasonable inquiry. But should you think my remarks fall too far short of this object, or are otherwise too crude and imperfect, I beg you will pardon the attempt, and purify the pages in the favourite element of the *Pársís*.†

M. ANQUETIL DU PERRON, who first translated the *Zend* books into French, did not doubt that the *Zend* was the old language of *Media*, and that the books preserved in that ancient dialect were the authentic works of ZOROASTER, written of course five or six centuries before Christ. Mr. ERSKINE, on the contrary, imagines, first, the *Zend* to be a dialect of *Sanscrit*, introduced from India for religious purposes, and never spoken in any part of Persia; and, second, the *Zend* books to have been composed, or at least restored from memory, changed, augmented, and brought into their present form, in the reign of ARDASHÍR BĀBAGĀN, about 230 years after Christ.

* Vide *Transactions of the Bombay Literary Society*, vol. ii. p. 295.

† Or fire worshippers.

I must confess that the first hypothesis, although far from being proved by ANQUETIL, upon the whole, appears to me the most easy and natural ; and the other, although supported by many sagacious and interesting observations, seems still involved in the most inextricable difficulties.

First, it is remarkable that other learned men (amongst whom is Sir WM. JONES) have supposed, on the contrary, that *Sanscrit* was introduced as a foreign language into India from Irán ; and one cannot help thinking this much more likely, supposing that the great conquest or migration which spread *Sanscrit* all over the northern, and by far the most extensive part of India, had taken place before the beginning of history ; for it is evident that all the modern dialects of *Hindústán*, as well as the *Guzeratí* and *Mahratta*, are chiefly derived from *Sanscrit*, and that consequently this must have been introduced into India before they originated ; just as Latin must have existed in Spain and Gaul long before the modern Spanish, Portuguese, and French were formed : but seeing that the grammatical structure of the *Telugu*, *Tamil*, *Carnatacá*, and *Malayal'ma* agrees exactly with the Finnish and Tartar dialects in Northern and Central Asia, I imagine that one great race of men, which may be stiled the Scythian, in the most ancient times, extended from the Frozen Sea to the Indian Ocean, until the chain was broken by a great inundation of people of our own race, which, for want of a more convenient name, I shall venture to call the *Japhetic*, issuing from Eastern Persia, and taking possession of somewhat more than *Hindústán*. Observing on the map how the above-mentioned Indian aborigines of *Malayalam*, of *Carnata*, of *Sholen*, of *Telingana*, &c. are now situated in the southern extremity and along the eastern coast of the country, it appears most likely that they were driven into that situation by the torrent of a warlike people from the west. Another circumstance tends to corroborate this hypothesis : although the northern dialects in India are all derived from the *Sanscrit*, yet they contain a number of words of uncertain origin ; for instance, in *Hindústáni*, روتى, *bread*, توبى *hat*, اتنا *thus, so many*, &c. ; most of these words will be found in the *Tamil* and other dialects of the south, and therefore seem to be remnants of the aborigines, who were not altogether exterminated or expelled, although greatly overpowered, just as one might find some Gaelic words in modern French, which properly belong to Welsh or *Erse*.

But, to return to Persia : that the *Zend* is not mentioned in the preface to the *Farhang Jehángiri* among the other dialects of *Irán*, a circumstance on which Mr. ERSKINE lays peculiar stress, seems to me of much less

consequence. It shows only that the *Musalmán* author had not extended his inquiries into the *Gueber* antiquities so far back; but knowing the *Pahlaví* to be an obsolete language of the *Guebers*, imagined that all their books were written in that dialect, which mistake I have frequently observed myself even amongst well-informed Europeans. Not only was HYDE much mistaken about these languages;* but even Sir WM. JONES seems, unaccountably enough, to have confounded *Zend* and *Pahlaví* with *Pársí*, or the modern *Gueber* dialect of the Persian.† At all events, the omission is no more to be wondered at than that FIRDAUSÍ makes no mention whatever of the Median dynasty, as Mr. ERSKINE has observed.‡ The fact is, that the *Musalmáns* had no idea whatever of those remote ages, and did not think it worth their while to search after any information about them in the writings of the *Pársís* or the Greeks. AMÍR ABDALLA BEN TAHER's expression respecting the loves of WAMIN and ADHRA, quoted by Mr. ERSKINE, contains the key to this strange ignorance. "We read the *Korán*," said the AMÍR, "we read no books but the *Korán* and the traditions. These others are useless. This is a work of the *Magi*, and is evil in our sight." Besides this, an inquiry into the *Zend*, *Pahlaví*, and Greek records would have required the serious and very difficult study of languages, extremely different from modern Persian, which could never be expected from a *Musalmán*, especially considering the total want of necessary means for such study. Moreover, the enumeration of the Persian dialects in the *Farhang Jehángirí*, is evidently incomplete. Seven are mentioned, of which four belong to the provinces east of the Persian desert, *viz.* *Soghdí* in Soghdiana, *Herri* in Khorassán, *Závelí* in Zábulistán, and *Sagzí* in Sejistán; the other three are to be placed west of that great barrier, *viz.* *Fársí* and *Deri* (the court dialect of *Fárs*) in Fársistán and Kermán, and *Pahlaví*, according to Mr. ERSKINE's most ingenious hypothesis, on the western frontiers of the empire in Khuzistán, Láristán, and perhaps Kurdistán. By an inspection of the map, it will be seen that no language is assigned to the provinces of Shirván, Gilán, and Aderbaiján, not to speak of Irák, and in short the whole of ancient Media, a country as extensive as one of the great kingdoms of Europe, and just the very country where ZOROASTER, by every

* Vide ANQUETIL DU PERRON's "Vie de ZOROASTRE," in his *Zendavesta*, page 2, note 1.

† In his Treatise on the "Orthography of Asiatic words," fourth specimen.

‡ P. 309, c. 25, in vol. ii. of the *Transactions of the Literary Society of Bombay*.

tradition, is said to have flourished ; where the sacred fires are produced by nature herself ; where the chief seat of the fire-worship is known to have been, and in the name of which (*Adarbaiján*) the old *Zend* word for fire (*atars*) is preserved to this very day, more than two thousand years after the extinction of its ancient power and glory. From all this, I think it may be fairly concluded that the author of the *Farhang Jehángirí* was wholly ignorant of the ancient language of Media, which had been almost entirely supplanted before his time by the Tartar or Turkish ; that he consequently proves nothing either *pro* or *con* ; and that it may, for all he says or omits, as well have been the *Zend* as any thing else.

After having observed that the *Zend* has been omitted in this preface, Mr. ERSKINE next proceeds (p. 299) : “ Indeed there seems no reason to believe that it ever was a spoken language within the limits of the Persian empire. It has every appearance of being foreign to Persia, and its use was probably confined to the sacred books of that country. There can be no doubt in what class of languages the *Zend* is to be ranked, it is altogether *Sanscrit*,” &c. &c. In opposition to others, I beg to observe, that the affinity between *Sanscrit* and *Zend* is by no means sufficient to establish the hypothesis that the *Zend* is an Indian dialect, never spoken any where in Persia ; nor do I find any other sufficient argument for this assertion. The Greek, the Latin, and perhaps more than any European tongue, the Lithuanian, approach very nearly to *Sanscrit* ; yet the former have been, and the latter is, certainly spoken, and that at a great distance from India. Not to speak of the hypothesis formerly mentioned, that the *Sanscrit*, in times anterior to recorded history, probably had issued from Irán, and been spread over India by a conquering people, which would admirably account for the great resemblance of *Zend* and *Sanscrit*. The difference between the *Pahlaví* and *Fársí*, on one hand, and the *Zend* on the other, which Mr. ERSKINE next alleges, equally fails in making good his hypothesis, because the *Pahlaví* and *Fársí* are not to be derived from the *Zend*. The Medians and Persians were two distinct but co-existing nations ; their languages therefore may naturally be supposed to have been two different but kindred dialects. The *Pahlaví* also was not spoken in Media, it originated at least at a considerable distance from this kingdom ; so that it cannot be expected that one of these languages should contain all the roots of the other, especially considering that all the remaining specimens of *Zend* are commonly supposed to have been written five hundred years *before* the Christian era, and

the oldest books of the Persians nine hundred years *after* Christ, which makes a space of fourteen hundred years, during which period, the *Fársí*, continuing to be a living language, must naturally have undergone a very considerable alteration. With respect to the *Pahlaví*, although it is more ancient than the *Fársí*, yet as it is confessedly mixed with the latter and Chaldean or Syriac, still less can it be expected that the *Zend* should account for its structure and expressions.

Thus much in the first instance, to invalidate the opinion above mentioned. I shall next try to establish positively that the relation between *Sanscrit* and *Zend* is not so close as to make the latter a mere dialect of the former, nor the difference between the *Zend* and *Fársí* so great as to make the former appear a foreign language, introduced from another country. I must here insert some grammatical details, which I perhaps overrate as my own discoveries, but which I think indispensable, in order to judge of a language so little known. I even hope they may have some interest for philologists, as they are derived, not from the memoirs and vocabularies of ANQUETIL, but from some of the most accurate and ancient manuscripts existing.

The pronunciation and whole external form of the *Zend* is very different from that of the *Sanscrit*. It has twelve single vowels, fourteen diphthongs (*ai, ái, au, áu, ao, áo, ni, ní*), &c., and three triphthongs (*aei, aoi, aou*), besides the syllables formed by the consonants *y* and *w*, and it has thirty consonants. There are some few figures more; for instance, the letter *y* has two forms in the beginning of words different from a third one, used only in the middle, and *w* has one for the beginning, but another for the middle of words; but there are only forty-two * really different letters. In

* As I have no where seen a correct *Zend* alphabet, I shall here go through that given by ANQUETIL in the *Zendavesta*, tom. ii, p. 24, in *Mem. de l'Académie des Belles Lettres*, tom. xxxi, and repeated in MENINSKI's *Thesaurus*, introd. tab. 2 (second edition), in order to show what original character I mean by each of the letters mentioned in the text already, or occurring in the words to be quoted in the following lines. His No. 1 is short *a* or *u*, according to GILCHRIST's system, but not *e*; No. 2 is *b*, No. 3 is *t*, and No. 4 is the English *j*, or French *dj*; No. 5 contains two distinct letters, as I infer from finding them used in different words, and never confounded in any good manuscript; the latter character I take for *q*, or the Arab ق; the former for the same letter aspirated *qh*, that is to say ح, because I have observed that the line which makes the lower part of the figure even in other letters, denotes aspiration. No 6 contains four characters, which make three distinct letters: the first is the common *d*; the second I would express by the Anglo-Saxon and Icelandic ð, it is never confounded, though sometimes

Sanscrit there are also twelve single vowels; but four of them are quite different from *Zend*, viz. *rī*, *ri*, *lū*, *lū*. *Sanscrit* has only two diphthongs (*ei*, *ou*), and

sometimes regularly interchanged with *d*; the two last characters are only various modes of writing the same letter, viz. *th*, formed from *t* by the sign of aspiration just mentioned. Nos. 7 and 8 are the English letters *r* and *z*, not the German *z* or *ts*. No. 9 is a kind of *s*, corresponding to the first *s* in Nagari स् : I would express it in European characters by *ç*, because it is usually changed to *c* or *k* in connected languages; for instance, the Sanscrit *paçah*, *Zend* *paçus*, is the Latin *pecus*, &c. No. 10 exhibits three characters: the first is the common *s*, but frequently confounded with the last or *sh*, because in *Pahlavī* it is used for *sh*, and *Pahlavī* has been more familiar than *Zend* to the copyists of the *Zendavesta* for a considerable period; in the oldest manuscripts, however, they are pretty accurately distinguished. The character in the middle appears in the best manuscripts in such a form that it is evidently composed of *s* (the first of No. 10) and *k* (No. 13). Of course it is not to be considered as a single letter, but as *sk*; sometimes, however, it is confounded with *sh*. No. 11 is the Arab ع. Nos. 12 and 13 are the common European *f* and *k*. No. 14 contains two characters: the former is the common hard *g*, the latter I suppose to be a mere mistake, as I never met with any such figure for any kind of *g*. No. 15 is our *m*. No. 16 is an aspirated *m*, formed by joining the line of aspiration to the simple *m*; but as it is written indifferently either in this way or with the two distinct characters *hm* (Nos. 19 and 15), it can scarcely be considered but as an abbreviation. No. 17 is our *n*. No. 18 contains two different characters, of distinct use and signification: the latter is the common English and Danish *v* hard, the former is the soft English *w*, in the beginning of words, for in the middle the same sound is expressed by the character No. 35, to which, of course, this ought to have been transposed. No. 19 is the strong English and Danish *h*. No. 20 is the consonant *y* expressed with two different figures, both of which are only used in the beginning of words. No. 21 exhibits, in the first place, the same consonant *y* as written in the middle of words; in the second place, the vowel *i* long. No. 22 is the English *sh*, French *tch*, and Swedish *k*, before *a*, *i*, *y*, *ä* and *ö*; I would rather express it with *c* alone, always to be pronounced as the Italian *ce*, *ci*, because in Sanscrit, and many other Indian languages, it occurs aspirated, and ought then to be written *ch* in analogy with *j*, *jh*, *k*, *kh*, *g*, *gh*, &c. No. 23 is *p*. No. 24 is *ch*, or the French *j*. No. 25 is the vowel *i* short (not *e*), corresponding to the long *i* already mentioned (No. 21). The next number has two characters, representing two different short vowels; the former is the Italian, German, and Danish *u* short, the English *oo* in *book*, *good*, &c.; the latter is the common *o* short. No. 27 is the vowel *ó* long, corresponding to the short *o* just mentioned. No. 28 exhibits two different vowels: the former is the Danish *æ* short, the English *ea* in *measure*, or *a* in *can*, *fancy*; French *è* in *après*, &c., German *ä* short: I prefer writing it with *æ* diphthong, because it occurs frequently long, which must be marked with an accent above, but this requires that the character should have no other mark or accent before hand. It is also, both short and long, written in this way in several other languages; for instance, Greenlandic, Singhalese, (a) &c. The long *ǣ*, which has been quite overlooked by ANQUETIL, is written in *Zend* with the same character as the short, only protracted considerably

has all these letters in genuine Persian, not Arabic, words preserved even till this day; for instance, آفتاب (*áfáb*) "the sun;" آغاز (*ágház*) "beginning;" دهقان (*dehkán*) "a villager;" دختر (*dokhter*) "a daughter;" از (*az*) "of;" زنگ (*zhang*) "rust." This coincidence in sound with the other *Iránian* languages, and difference from the Indian ones, tends strongly to restore the *Zend* from India to the old place assigned to it by ANQUETIL DU PERRON, according to the common hypothesis.

2. The grammatical structure or system of inflexions in the *Zend*, corresponds not only with the *Sanscrit*, but in some instances approaches nearer to the Phrygian class of languages (that is to say, Greek and Latin, with their different dialects); in others it is quite peculiar, which seems to show that it is a distinct language, to be arranged between the Sanscrit and Greek. The first class or declension of nouns in Sanscrit, *viz.* those in *an*, *ah*, *á*, the Greek nouns in *ov*, *os*, *η*, are here terminated in *æm*, *ó*, *æ*. The other classes in Sanscrit and Greek are also found here, terminating in *is*, *us* (corresponding to the fourth declination in Latin), &c. The neuters in *os*, *us*, for instance, *γενος* *genus*, are here terminated in *ó*, and have a very peculiar inflexion.

As a specimen of *Zend* declension, I shall here insert some cases of the singular of three different classes of substantives.

Nom.	<i>Zarapustró-paitis</i>	Master.	<i>Manó</i>	Mind.
Voc.	<i>Zarapustra-paiti</i>		(<i>Manó</i>)	
Acc.	<i>Zarapustræm-paitim</i>		<i>Manó</i>	
Instr.		<i>Manaḡha</i>	
Dat.	<i>Zarapustrái-paite</i>		<i>Manaḡhe</i>	
Abl.	<i>Zarapustráth-paitois</i>		<i>Manaḡhó</i>	
Gen.	<i>Zarapustræhe-paitóis</i>		<i>Manaḡhó.</i>	

The two last paradigms are the Sanscrit *patih* and *manah*, Greek *μνος*.

The dative in *ái* is the Greek *αι*, the genitive in *ois* is very different from the Sanscrit in *eh* or *yáh*. The neuters in *ó* have substituted *ḡh* for *s* in Sanscrit and *r* in Latin. The adjectives are declined in the same manner as the substantives. The superlative terminates in *tæmó*, Sanscrit *tamah*. The pronouns are in some instances more regular than those in Sanscrit: for instance, the accusative singular of the Sanscrit word *idam* "this," is here, neuter *imath*, masculine *imæm*, feminine *imam*. The numerals also are by no means mere variations of the Sanscrit ones: for instance, *qsas* "six," Sanscrit *shas*; *hapta* "seven," which is the Greek *ἑπτα*, Sanscrit *sapta*. The

ordinals are in the masculine *paoiryó*, *bityó*, *prityó*; (Icelandic *príðji*, genitive *príðja*), *túiryó*, *pugðó*, *qstwó*, *haptapó*, *astæmó*, *náumó*, *daçmó*, which differ much more from Sanscrit than the Latin or Lithuanian do. The verbs terminate in *ámi*, *emi*, *omi*, like the Sanscrit, but this termination is also frequent in Æolic and Lithuanian. The conjugation however is nearest to the Sanscrit. The imperative has even here the first person: for instance, on the plate in ANQUETIL's *Zendavesta*, tom. i, page 77, the fourth line: "*Frawaráne mazdayacno, Zarapustris, wídaewó ahura-thkaeshó dátai hada dátai wídaewái Zarapustrái*," &c., which seems not to be the present tense, as ANQUETIL considers it, but a solemn vow: *Venerabor* (*semper ut verus*) ORMAZDIS *cultor*, ZOROASTRIS *assecla*,* *dæmonum adversarius*, *sanctæ legis sectator datum* (*hic in mundum?*), *datum contra dæmones ZOROASTREM*,† &c. It is very doubtful whether this *datum contra dæmones*, or *datum (nobis) antidæmonem*, be really the book *Vendidád*, as ANQUETIL takes it, or only an epithet applied to ZOROASTER, but that it is a solemn declaration, or perhaps prayer, *May I always worship*, &c., and not a mere relation, seems very clear.

3. But to return to the language: *in modern Persian a considerable number of radical words are evidently derived from Zend, not Sanscrit*, which phenomenon cannot easily be accounted for, if the *Zend* were a foreign language, never spoken in Persia; for instance:

Zend.	English.	Persian.	Zend.	English.	Persian.
Gæpó	World	گیتی	Qsafs	Night	شب
A'çmánó	Heaven	آسمان	Drajó	Long	دراز
Hwaræ-qsætó	Sun	خورشید	Zairi	Gold	زر
Máçg'hó	Moon	ماه	Çtaomi	I praise	ستایم
Máhyó	Month		Mærætó	A man	مرد
Çtárs	Star	ستاره	Cashma	Eye	چشم
Raoqsno	Light	روشن	Gaoshó	Ear	گوش
A'tars	Fire	آتش	Zafanó	Tongue	زبان
Garæmo	Warm	گرم	Bazwáo	The arm	بازو

* The Zend word *Zarapustris* is an adjective declined, as *paitis*, as might be said in Latin *Zoroastrianus*.

† The Zend verb governs the dative, not the accusative, as the Latin *Veneror*.

Zend.	English.	Persian.	Zend.	English.	Persian.
Záwaræ	Strength	زور	Qhağha (acc.qhağhraem)	Sister	خواهر
Mahrkó	Death	مرگت	Açpó	Horse	اسب
Qsahyó	King	شاه	Mæræghó	Bird	مُرغ
Shórpráo	A town	شهر	Pæræçath	He asked	پرسید

I am well aware, that several of these words may be compared with *Sanscrit* expressions; nay, some of them appear even in Armenian, Greek, Sclavonian, and Icelandic; but what I would intimate by this comparison is, that the Persians have derived them from the *Zend*; for instance, ستاره is not immediately borrowed from the Sanscrit *tárá*, nor from the Greek αστηρ, but from the Zend *çtárs*; چشم not from the Sanscrit *caxuh*; بازو not from Sanscrit *bahuh*; زور is a different root from the Sanscrit *çúra*, which also exists in the Zend *çúró* “a hero;” اسب is not from the Sanscrit *açvah* (Latin *equus*), but from the Zend *açpó*, and that this is the genuine Iránian form, appears from ancient names, such as Ὑρασπης, &c. In the same way هزار *a thousand*, is clearly derived from the Zend *hazağro*, not from the Sanscrit *sahasram*, although these two words may perhaps be originally one and the same, and so in many other instances. This alone seems to put it almost beyond a doubt that the *Zend* was the old popular language, at least of a great part of Irán; for if it were introduced as a sacred language for religious purposes, how came such words and forms of words, not at all religious, to come down to the people, and to be preserved so obstinately by them through a period of more than a thousand years, even after a thorough change of religion? The fact is, that these words belong to the radical expressions, which, even in the most mixed languages, will always betray the true origin of the people; for instance, in English, if you look back to the translations of these words, you will observe, that all the corresponding expressions are Anglo-Saxon, with only a slight change, neither Danish nor French. If now we suppose the true history of England to be lost, and that any body should pretend that the old Anglo-Saxon was mere German, never spoken in the country but introduced with some slight alterations to serve religious purposes, he might be contradicted, merely because such words could never have descended to the people, nor have been preserved by them through a long and dark period in that particular form, different from every other Teutonic dialect, unless the

language to which they originally belonged had once been current among their ancestors.

In addition, I shall only mention two other circumstances, which seem very powerfully to support the old hypothesis, that the *Zend* was the real language of ancient Media. The first is the language of the cuneiform Inscriptions of Persepolis, as far as discovered by Professor GROTEFEND. I will readily allow, with Baron DE SACY, in his letter to MILLIN, that the discovery is not yet completed; but as far as we may judge from the features of an embryo, it looks very like the language of ZOROASTER; and where it is very dissimilar, I am inclined to suspect some mistake; for instance, in the inscription from NIEBUHR, tom. ii, plate 24, quoted in BELLINO's Account of GROTEFEND's Discovery,* I doubt the correctness of the genitive plural in *é, ch, á, o*, which is not *Zend*, and suppose the true reading should be *a, n, a, m*, which (*anam*) is the usual termination of genitive plurals of the first class of nouns. The two new letters there restored, *viz. n* and *m*, would also bring the last word of this inscription, *á, kh, é, o, ch, ó, sh, ó, h*, much nearer to *Achæmenides*, which DE SACY expected to find here: I think it ought to be read thus, *ágamnósóh*. The extreme confusion and inaccuracy of ANQUETIL's alphabet has prevented GROTEFEND, who took it for an established foundation, from determining the true power and number of the letters. Thus, in the *Zend* cuneiform alphabet, exhibited by BELLINO, there are only thirty letters (three of which are marked as doubtful) out of the forty-two really distinct characters mentioned above,† and among those thirty the related letters (for instance, *u, ú, w, v, i, í, y, &c.*) are not accurately distinguished; nay, in the inscription just quoted, one character is read both *é* and *á*, although another character, occurring thrice in the same inscription, is also expressed by *á*. Surely before the discovery is completed, it must be laid down as a fundamental supposition, *that each character has only one determined sound, and that no two characters signify exactly the same*. This last, it is true, is the case with *y* and *w* in the *Zend* written alphabet; but this alphabet, according

* Vide *Transactions of the Literary Society of Bombay*, vol. ii. p. 170.

† Sir WM. JONES has already observed many more letters in these inscriptions. "In five of them," says he, in his *Discourse on the Persians*, "the letters which are separated by points, may be reduced to forty; at least I can distinguish no more essentially different." The remaining two letters did not occur, perhaps, in the five inscriptions he examined.

to Mr. ERSKINE's ingenious observation, is lately formed from the *Pahlavi*, because I fancy the ancient cuneiform alphabet was too inconvenient in books; and by frequent use in hand-writing for many ages, those little excrescences might easily originate, though they cannot reasonably be expected to occur in an ancient original alphabet. It must still be observed that the cuneiform inscriptions are probably not written in ancient *Median*, but in ancient *Persian*; and consequently that all their words and forms cannot justly be expected to agree altogether with *Zend*: but that there should be, notwithstanding this, so strong a resemblance between them and the *Zend*, in spelling, inflexion, and the words themselves is, in my opinion, no slight evidence for the *Zend* having been the ancient language of Media.

The other circumstance I would adduce, is the dialect of an Iránian tribe, called by the Georgians *Osi*, by the Russians *Osetinzi*, living on the very summit of Caucasus; at present without any particular religion, and supposed by M. KLAPROTH (in his journey into the Caucasus and Georgia), from historical probability, to be an ancient *Median* colony. This *Osic* dialect has lost the old complicated grammatical structure, like the modern Persian, but it has preserved some peculiar words and forms, agreeing with the *Zend*, though differing from all other Iránian dialects. I shall only mention a few, extracted from a small but valuable collection in manuscript, kindly communicated to me by the learned Professor F. ADELUNG: *خور* the sun (not *خور*), *Zend* *hwarə*; *زخ* earth, *Zend* *záo*; *ارت* fire, by transposition in *Zend*, *átars*. Another curious transposition you will have observed in the *Zend* words quoted above, namely *qs* for the modern Persian *sh*, in the European languages *sk*. The *Zend* which, from ancient names in Greek *Ῥαξάνα*, &c., we may infer to be the genuine, is also with a slight alteration preserved in *Osic*; for instance, *احاف* night; *Zend* *qsafs*, Persian *شب* (*shab*); *اخسار* six, *Zend* *qswas*, Persian *شش* (*shash*); again, *اخير* milk, Persian *شير* (*shir*). We may trace these words in the Icelandic *skúm*, Danish *skumring*, darkness; Icelandic, *skyr*; Danish, *skörmelk*, a sort of sour milk, &c.

As to the authenticity of the *Zendavesta*, it seems to stand or fall with the antiquity and reality of the language wherein it is written: to state nothing, however, without some kind of proof, I shall shortly mention the reasons on which my own persuasion rests. The *Pahlavi*, as well as *Pársí*, evidently presupposes the *Zend*, and it is apparent that the religion

of the *Magi* must have been delivered in *Zend* long before it was preached in *Pahlaví* or *Pársí*. Thus a great number of angels, and other celestial or infernal beings, derive their names in *Pahlaví* and *Pársí* from the *Zend*; and although the signification may now be obscure even in this language, as a dead one, of which the knowledge remains to be recovered, yet the *Zend* form of the words is evidently the genuine and original one, because their terminations are here common ones, and their component parts recur frequently in other combinations, which shows they must have been significant forms and words in this language, afterwards corrupted in *Pahlaví* and *Pársí*, so as to convey no meaning whatever; for instance, *Ahuró mazdáo*, *Pahlavi Anhuma*, Persian اورمزد. The *Pahlaví* may be a corruption of *Elohim* perhaps (instead of *Alhuma*), but the *Pársí* is evidently borrowed from the *Zend*, in which language *Ahuró*, corresponding to the syllable اور, is no part of the name of the Deity, but an epithet used even about other beings, and meaning, I suppose, *holy* or *most holy*. *Mazdáo* only is the proper name, therefore the adjective is always dropped in composition; for instance, *Mazda yaçná* "a votary of ORMUZD," *Mazda-dátó* "given by ORMUZD," &c. *Agro mainyus* is corrupted to *Ahriman*, which has no distinct signification, whereas the *Zend* expression contains clearly an adjective in the masculine. *Agro*, "bad," "evil," and a substantive masculine *māinyus*, "spirit," derived from the above-mentioned neuter *manó*, "mind," and analogous to the expression *dus-māinyus*, enemy, Persian دشمن, Greek δυσμενης, *Amæshó çpæxtó* is in *Pahlaví* corrupted to *Amhuspand*, in *Pársí* امشاسپند which is equally void of sense in both languages: the *Zend* expression consists of a substantive and an adjective; the former I take to be properly the name of *archangels*, the adjective *çpæxtó* means *excellent*, *exalted*, and occurs frequently in other combinations; for instance, in the beginning of *Izeshne*, ORMUZD is styled *Māinyus çpæxtótæmó*, i.e. *spiritus excellentissimus*. *Missro* (which is instead of *Missras*), is called in *Pahlaví* *Matún*, and in *Pársí* مهر (Mih), from the Greek Μηρ. I think it is clear that the *Zend* is the true form of the name. *Qshapró wairyó* is in *Pahlaví* changed to *Shatevin*, in *Parsi* to شهریور (Shahriv), which has no meaning; the *Zend* again is composed of a substantive *Qshapro*, a *king*, and an adjective *wairyó*, which the *Pársis* use to translate میراد کاهمه. The first part of the word is both in *Pahlaví* and *Pársí* confounded with *shóipre*, a

town ; Pahlaví *shatun*, Persian شهر, which is, however, another root. It would be to no purport to quote more instances, especially as the *Zend* is still so unknown as to throw little light on the real meaning of those names, nor can it be at all necessary ; as it must certainly have been observed long ago that scarcely any of the names of beings, implements, ceremonies, &c. belonging to the *Pársí* religion (such as *Ohmover*, *Ferwerdín*, *Isjend-armed*, *Anirán*, *Ized*, *Barsom*, *Penám*, *Kosti*, *Sadre*, &c. &c.) can be explained by, or even retraced to any other language than *Zend*, which is enough to show that this religion must have been originally founded or instituted in that language. Nor would it else have been preferred to the *Pahlaví* and *Pársí* in all religious prelections and public and private prayers by every one who adores the name of ORMUZD, of what sect and country soever.

It will easily be seen how strongly this remark confirms the opinion that *Zend* was the ancient vernacular language of Media ; for if it be the original language wherein the *Pársí* religion was first promulgated, it most certainly cannot be any foreign dialect at all ; or else, how should it be connected with that religion ? Is the *Pársí* religion to have been introduced into Persia from India ? or did the Persian prophet go to that country, in order to study the Indian language and philosophy ? And, in either case, why has not the sacred language of India been introduced as it was ? How could it enter the mind of that legislator, or of any body, to change almost every word, every declension, and every conjugation of a foreign language, sufficiently obscure as it was ? For, in fact, I scarcely recollect ever meeting with a single word in *Zend* agreeing altogether with *Sanscrit*. Further, why did he introduce a vast number of letters and words never used in any proper Indian dialect, some of which appear even in Greek, German, Icelandic, &c. ; for instance, the preposition *math*, *with* (Latin *cum*), Icelandic *med*, German *met*, Greek μετᾱ. It is worthy of remark even, that the *Zend math*, as well as the Icelandic *med*, and German *met*, govern the *dative* ; whereas, the Greek μετᾱ requires the *genitive* in this sense. In short, I do not see why ZOROASTER should adopt a foreign language ; or, if he had adopted it, how he should have succeeded in converting any body ; nor how, though he, through worldly power, might have introduced his form of worship, that adopted foreign language should ever have penetrated to the commonpeople. Never did any great sage or legislator of antiquity adopt a language foreign to his people. CONFUCIUS wrote in Chinese,

MENU in Sanscrit, MOSES in Hebrew, PYTHAGORAS and LYCURGUS used the Doric, SOLON and SOCRATES the Attic, JESUS the Syriac, the doctrines of ALFATHER (ODIN) are preserved in Icelandic, and those of MUHAMMED in Arabic. It is only in latter ages, remote from the foundation of the religion, when the colloquial dialect changes, or when the religion is propagated to foreign countries, that the religious language becomes different from the vulgar one, because the people cling with veneration to that particular tongue, in which the religion was at first promulgated.

Finally, if the *Zend* was the real tongue of ZOROASTER, in which his religion was originally made known, the *Zend* books cannot possibly have originated in the time of ARDASHÍR BĀBAGÁN. After the religion had been neglected, and the language of the land changed for ages past, how could any thing be forged or composed in such an obsolete and difficult tongue, with three genders, six cases at least in each of the two numbers, six classes of nouns, pronouns of a peculiar inflexion, six or more classes of verbs, with many distinct tenses, all of which are extremely different from the colloquial dialects? How could such a number of complicated rules, which, even with a good grammar at hand, would require a very serious study, be constantly observed in mind in a book as large as the Bible, if it were produced or restored from memory in an ignorant age? Farther, if the priests, countenanced by the government, restored one of the twenty-one books of ZOROASTER, why did not they restore the rest also, or avail themselves of the opportunity to supply the defect by something of their own, or something to the advantage of that government. Certainly, whether the *Zendavesta* is conjectured to have been wholly composed, or only restored by the ignorant priests in the age of ARDASHÍR BĀBAGÁN, it is a miracle a thousand times more improbable than that some fragments, allowed fairly to be less than one-twentieth part of the whole work of ZOROASTER, may have escaped the persecution of ALEXANDER and the indifference of succeeding ages. Nay, it is difficult to conceive how the *Zendavesta* could ever be wholly destroyed: by ALEXANDER it could scarcely be effected throughout that immense empire, and after his time no violent persecution took place until the *Muhammedan* conquest; besides, subsequently to ALEXANDER, the text must have existed, when it was translated into *Pahlavi*. When these translations were made is not yet ascertained; but it is well known that the *Pahlavi* flourished during the reign of the Ashkanian or Parthian dynasty, and the *Pársi* during the Sassanian: as, however, the

old religion was disregarded by the Parthian kings, and ARDESHÍR BABAGAN is famous for his zealous endeavours to restore religion and literature, I think it not improbable they may have been made during his reign, about 230 years A.C.; afterwards the *Pahlavi* even fell into disuse, until it was at last publicly prohibited by an order of the king: consequently, the text must have existed at the time mentioned, and it must have been considerably older, because it was grown so obscure and unintelligible as to require a translation, and the names of beings to be venerated or combated became so obsolete and corrupted, as to lose the signification they originally conveyed; nay, it is evident that the translators in many places did not understand the old text properly, but substituted some folly of their own in the place of its very simple injunctions. I shall only venture to quote one signal instance. In the fourth chapter or *Fargard* of the *Vendidad*, there are mentioned several crimes to be expiated by certain fines; again, the same crimes are enumerated and a corporal punishment determined for each, I imagine in case of want of money to pay the fine; but instead of this, the *Pahlavi* translator speaks of years to be passed in hell! The text cannot, then, have been produced during the dark Ashkanian period; and during the reign of ALEXANDER and his successors it is much less likely; nor is there, to my knowledge, any hint in history or tradition, which might lead to the suspicion that the *Zendavesta* was forged in this whole period. We are then here arrived at the times before ALEXANDER, at the very dynasty under which ZOROASTER is said to have flourished. Farther than this, I by no means pretend to go, nor to determine exactly when ZOROASTER lived. I do not despair, however, that some interesting historical facts, or hints at least, may still be discovered in the *Vistasp-yesht*, of which I have a very fine copy in *Zend*, perhaps even in the other *Zend* books, when they shall be scrutinized and published by some sober critic who understands the text, which was not the case with ANQUETIL DU PERRON. I am equally far from pretending that all the *Zend* fragments we now have are the genuine works of ZOROASTER himself, but only that they were all of them composed before ALEXANDER or immediately after his conquest. Till that event, I imagine the *Zend* was still a living language, and some prayers, liturgical forms, &c., might easily be composed by the priests long after the prophet was deceased; but after the conquest, a great confusion took place: the old language was lost, the religion neglected, the sacred text was to be

translated, and it seems impossible that any correct piece should have been composed afterwards in such an obscure ancient dialect, or if it were composed, that it should get such an authority and currency, not only among the priests but in every private devotion of the common people.

(Signed) E. RASK.